

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

KEVIN L. FOREHAND,	§
	§ No. 407, 2011
Defendant Below-	§
Appellant,	§
	§ Court Below—Superior Court
v.	§ of the State of Delaware
	§ in and for New Castle County
STATE OF DELAWARE,	§ Cr. ID No. 0809000884
	§
Plaintiff Below-	§
Appellee.	§

Submitted: August 15, 2011

Decided: August 19, 2011

Before **STEELE**, Chief Justice, **HOLLAND** and **RIDGELY**, Justices

ORDER

This 19th day of August 2011, it appears to the Court that:

(1) On August 5, 2011, the Court received the appellant's notice of appeal from the Superior Court's order, dated and docketed on June 10, 2011, which denied his motion for postconviction relief. Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 6, a timely notice of appeal from that order should have been filed on or before July 11, 2011.

(2) On August 5, 2011, the Clerk issued a notice directing the appellant to show cause why the appeal should not be dismissed as untimely filed. The appellant filed his response to the notice to show cause on August

15, 2011. The appellant states that he did not receive notice, and was not aware, that his notice of appeal was due on or before July 11, 2011.

(3) Pursuant to Rule 6(a) (iii), a notice of appeal in any proceeding for postconviction relief must be filed within 30 days after entry upon the docket of the judgment or order being appealed. Time is a jurisdictional requirement.¹ A notice of appeal must be received by the Office of the Clerk within the applicable time period in order to be effective.² An appellant's *pro se* status does not excuse a failure to comply strictly with the jurisdictional requirements of Rule 6.³ Unless the appellant can demonstrate that the failure to file a timely notice of appeal is attributable to court-related personnel, his appeal may not be considered.⁴

(4) There is nothing in the record before us reflecting that the appellant's failure to file a timely notice of appeal in this case is attributable to court-related personnel. Consequently, this case does not fall within the exception to the general rule that mandates the timely filing of a notice of appeal. Thus, the Court concludes that this appeal must be dismissed.

¹ *Carr v. State*, 554 A.2d 778, 779 (Del. 1989).

² Supr. Ct. R. 10(a).

³ *Carr v. State*, 554 A.2d at 779.

⁴ *Bey v. State*, 402 A.2d 362, 363 (Del. 1979).

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29(b), that this appeal is DISMISSED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Myron T. Steele
Chief Justice